

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,291	07/17/2003	Lilan Bao	16437	2480	
23389 7	590 03/28/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC			GRAHAM, MARK S		
400 GARDEN SUITE 300	CITY PLAZA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	Y, NY 11530		3711		
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	-	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	c ()			
Office Action Commence	10/621,291	BAO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark S. Graham	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communicated Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addre	ess			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the No period for reply is specified above, the maximum statut.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months afte earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MI, by statute, cause the application to become	v a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. IONTHS from the mailing date of this common ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on .					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	)⊠ This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the approximate the above claim(s) is/are 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the I	Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abey	/ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to be	•		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority do  2. Certified copies of the priority do  3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in the priority documents have been all Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)				
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	· —	lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)			

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6-8, 11-18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hillerich. Hillerich's innermost alternating laminations at the core may be considered the core section blocks with the surrounding laminations considered the "outer section at least partially surrounding the core."

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Chen et al. '660 (Chen).

Brown discloses the claimed device with the exception of the use of bamboo. (Brown's surrounding sections are oriented in orthogonal direction and thus at least some of them are inherently offset from the direction of the core sections). Although Brown does not specifically disclose the use of bamboo he makes clear that other woods used in the bat art may be used for the core and the surrounding sections. As disclosed by Chen it is known in the art to use bamboo. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used bamboo to make Brown's core and

Art Unit: 3711

surrounding sections if it was desired to obtain the particular advantages (low weight, flexibility) offered by bamboo.

Claims 9, 10, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillerich.

Concerning claims 9 and 10, Hillerich does not specify the thickness of his strips. However, absent a showing of unexpected results the exact thickness of the strips and thus the core section would obviously have been up to the ordinarily skilled artisan depending on the strength and flexibility characteristics desired in the bat.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, the examiner takes official notice that sanding a turned piece of wood such as a bat and finishing a bat are commonly known finishing techniques. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have done the same to finish Hillerich's bat to complete it.

Sadenwater, Bender et al., Buehler, Holman, Chen '659, Burrows, Johnson, Kelly et al., Young et al., Marsden, Rastetter, You, Smart, Lehman, MacKay Jr., and Shimizu have been cited for interest because they disclose similar bats.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S.

Graham at telephone number 571-272-4410.

MSG 3/24/05 Márk S. Graham Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711